

## REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present U.S. patent application. Claims 1-22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103. Claims 1, 3, 12, 13 and 20-22 have been amended. No claims have been canceled or added. Therefore, claims 1-22 remain pending.

### Claim Amendments

Claims 3, 12 and 22 have been amended to correct some errors in those claims, and not to overcome a cited reference.

### Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

#### Rejections of Claims 1, 3, 6-14, 16, 17 and 20-22 based on *Taniguchi* and *Holt*

Claims 1, 3, 6-14, 16, 17 and 20-22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,162,756 issued to Taniguchi et al. (*Taniguchi*) in view of Electronic Circuits – Digital and Analog by Holt (*Holt*). For at least the reasons set forth below, Applicants submit that claims 1, 3, 6-14, 16, 17 and 20-22 are not rendered obvious by *Taniguchi* in view of *Holt*.

Claim 1 recited the following:

a bias control circuit configured to provide a first bias voltage that enables the first amplifier and causes the first amplifier to operate in a linear mode, and a second bias voltage that enables the second amplifier and causes the second amplifier to operate in a linear mode.

Claim 13 is a method claim, and recites similar limitations.

*Tanaguchi* discloses a high frequency transmission line circuit constructed of a plurality of units, each unit including a pair of transmission lines. See col. 3, lines 64-68.

*Tanaguchi* also discloses a power divider/combiner utilizing the high frequency transmission line circuit, wherein the power divider/generator uses high frequency amplifier to amplify an input high frequency signal and obtain a high power, high frequency signal. See col. 3, lines 55-59; col. 9, lines 16-18.

Applicants agree with Examiner that *Tanaguchi* does not disclose a bias control circuit. See Office Action, page 3, lines 7-8. However, Examiner asserts that *Tanaguchi* “inherently must have a bias circuit because this is a necessary circuit needed so that the amplifier(s) can operate.” See Office Action, page 3, lines 8-9.

Applicants do not agree with Examiner that *Tanaguchi* inherently has a bias circuit. However, regardless of whether Examiner’s assertion is correct, Examiner has not established that merely having a bias circuit in *Tanaguchi* constitutes having a bias control circuit configured to provide a first bias voltage that enables the first amplifier and causes the first amplifier to operate in a linear mode, and a second bias voltage that enables the second amplifier and causes the second amplifier to operate in a linear mode, as recited in claims 1 and 13. Thus, *Tanaguchi* fails to disclose at least one limitation of claims 1 and 13.

Examiner cites *Holt* for the proposition that it would have been obvious “to provide *Tanaguchi* with a bias control circuit(s) that biases the first and second amplifiers such that linear operation is obtained for these amplifiers.” See Office Action, page 3, lines 28-30. Applicants do not agree with Examiner that it would have been obvious to *Tanaguchi* with a bias control circuit. However, regardless of whether Examiner’s assertion is correct, Examiner has not established that merely having a bias circuit in *Tanaguchi* constitutes having a bias control circuit configured to provide a first bias voltage that enables the first amplifier and causes the first amplifier to operate in a linear

mode, and a second bias voltage that enables the second amplifier and causes the second amplifier to operate in a linear mode, as recited in claims 1 and 13.

As a result, *Holt* fails to cure the deficiencies of *Tanaguchi* pointed out by Applicants. Thus, *Tanaguchi* in view of *Holt* fails to disclose at least one limitation of claims 1 and 13. Consequently, claims 1 and 13 are not rendered obvious by *Tanaguchi* in view of *Holt* for at least the reasons set forth above. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejections of claims 1 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

Claims 3 and 6-12 depend from claim 1. Claims 14, 16, 17 and 20-22 depend from claim 13. Because dependent claims include the limitations of the claims from which they depend, Applicants submit that claims 3, 6-12, 14, 16, 17 and 20-22 are not rendered obvious by *Tanaguchi* in view of *Holt* for at least the reasons set forth above.

Rejections of Claims 4, 5, 18 and 19 based on *Taniguchi*, *Holt* and *Kim*

Claims 4, 5, 18 and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over *Taniguchi* in view of *Holt*, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,617,929 issued to Kim et al. (*Kim*). For at least the reasons set forth below, Applicants submit that claims 4, 5, 18 and 19 are not rendered obvious by *Taniguchi* in view of *Holt* and *Kim*.

As explained above, *Taniguchi* in view of *Holt* fails to disclose a bias control circuit configured to provide a first bias voltage that enables the first amplifier and causes the first amplifier to operate in a linear mode, and a second bias voltage that enables the second amplifier and causes the second amplifier to operate in a linear mode, as recited in claims 1 and 13. Examiner does not cite *Kim* for the proposition that *Tanaguchi* in view of *Holt* includes such a bias control circuit. See Office Action, page 4, lines 18-26.

As a result, *Kim* fails to cure the deficiencies of *Tanaguchi* in view of *Holt* pointed out by Applicants. Thus, *Tanaguchi* in view of *Holt* and *Kim* fails to disclose at least one limitation of claims 1 and 13. Consequently, claims 1 and 13 are not rendered obvious by *Tanaguchi* in view of *Holt* and *Kim* for at least the reasons set forth above.

Claims 4 and 5 depend from claim 1. Claims 18 and 19 depend from claim 13. Because dependent claims include the limitations of the claims from which they depend, Applicants submit that claims 4, 5, 18 and 19 are not rendered obvious by *Tanaguchi* in view of *Holt* and *Kim* for at least the reasons set forth above. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejections of claims 4, 5, 18 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

Rejections of Claims 2 and 15 based on *Taniguchi*, *Holt* and *Cheng*

Claims 2 and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over *Taniguchi* in view of *Holt*, and further in view of *Cheng* et al., U.S. Patent Application No. 2002/0190790 (*Cheng*). For at least the reasons set forth below, Applicants submit that claims 2 and 15 are not rendered obvious by *Taniguchi* in view of *Holt* and *Cheng*.

As explained above, *Taniguchi* in view of *Holt* fails to disclose a bias control circuit configured to provide a first bias voltage that enables the first amplifier and causes the first amplifier to operate in a linear mode, and a second bias voltage that enables the second amplifier and causes the second amplifier to operate in a linear mode, as recited in claims 1 and 13. Examiner does not cite *Cheng* for the proposition that *Tanaguchi* in view of *Holt* includes such a bias control circuit. See Office Action, page 5, lines 1-7.

As a result, *Cheng* fails to cure the deficiencies of *Tanaguchi* in view of *Holt* pointed out by Applicants. Thus, *Tanaguchi* in view of *Holt* and *Cheng* fails to disclose

at least one limitation of claims 1 and 13. Consequently, claims 1 and 13 are not rendered obvious by *Tanaguchi* in view of *Holt* and *Cheng* for at least the reasons set forth above.

Claim 2 depends from claim 1. Claim 15 depends from claim 13. Because dependent claims include the limitations of the claims from which they depend, Applicants submit that claims 2 and 15 are not rendered obvious by *Tanaguchi* in view of *Holt* and *Cheng* for at least the reasons set forth above. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejections of claims 2 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

#### CONCLUSION

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that the rejections have been overcome. Therefore, claims 1-22 are in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully solicited. The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone if such contact would further the examination of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: November 5, 2004



\_\_\_\_\_  
Joseph A. Pugh  
Reg. No. 52,137

TriQuint Semiconductor, Inc.  
2300 NE Brookwood Parkway  
Hillsboro, OR 97124  
(503) 615-9616